



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/847,620	05/02/2001	Jong-Kon Choi	9903-14	5622

7590 04/09/2003

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
1030 S.W. Morrison Street
Portland, OR 97205

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

MITCHELL, JAMES M

[REDACTED] ART UNIT [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

2827

DATE MAILED: 04/09/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/847,620	Applicant(s) JONG-KON CHOI
	Examiner James Mitchell	Art Unit 2827

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 February 2003.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) 16-19 is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-15 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 3 and 13 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over admitted prior art (APA).

The admitted prior art (Fig 1-3; Page 8, Lines 7-29) discloses a method for manufacturing a semiconductor DMD package comprising a wafer (Fig 3, step 71) including a plurality of DMD chips (12) with a plurality of mirrors (16) and a plurality of pads formed at the periphery forming a photoresist on a mirror (Page 2, Lines 14-16), singulating a chip (steps 72 and 75) wherein the singulating comprises "fully cutting" the wafer (via half of the wafer fully cut), mounting the chip on top of a base substrate (20; step 77) and electrically interconnecting the bond pads (step 79), and removing the photoresist from the chip (73) and said package hermetically sealed (Page 1, Line 33).

Applicant's admitted prior art does not appear to removing the photoresist after the interconnection.

In any case, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice bounded by well known manufacturing constraints and ascertainable by routine experimentation and optimization to choose the particular claimed sequence because applicant has not

disclosed that the limitation is for a particular unobvious purpose, produces an unexpected result, or is otherwise critical. Moreover, it is well established that, in a well known process, the order of performing process steps is *prima facie* obvious in the absence of new or unexpected results. *Ex parte Rubin* 128 USPQ (PO BdPatApp 1959).

Claims 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicant's admitted prior art (APA) in combination with Mutsuo (JP 02-039442).

APA does not appear to show a metallic layer over the back surface of the wafer or a metallic adhesive, however Mutsuo (Fig 1) utilizes a metal layer (1) attached to the back surface of the semiconductor wafer with a metallic adhesive ("solder material"; Abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate a metal layer on the rear surface of the admitted prior art's wafer with a solder adhesive, in order to avoid defective bonding as taught by Matsuo (Abstract Purpose).

Claims 5, 6, 8 and 10-12, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA as applied to claim 5 and further in view of Takehara (JP 356115548).

The APA further discloses (Fig 3) removing the photoresist from the semiconductor chips (step 73) and forming an anti-sticking film on the active surface of the chip (step 74), hermetically sealing said chip by forming a metal ring on the periphery of the base (Page 1, Lines 30-33), attaching a window lid to the upper surface of the ring (page 2, Lines 1-2), wherein a distance between the upper base substrate

and the lower surface of the lid is greater than the height of one or more bonding wires (as shown in Fig 2), a reflectance coating formed on the lower surface of the window (Page 2, Lines 2-3) and a moisture getter attached to the metal lid frame (Page 2, Lines 4-5) with a heat sink stud (60) to the lower surface of the base substrate.

APA does not disclose a low melting point metal layer consisting of lead on the back surface of a wafer, however Takehara teaches a method of forming a lapping metal layer consisting of lead on the back surface of a wafer (Abstract Constitution).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to form a low melting point metal layer on the back of the admitted prior art's wafer in order to eliminate the improper connection of chips as taught by Takehara (Abstract Purpose). As such since the metal layer is placed over and covering a part of the wafer, it is lapping the back surface of the wafer.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA and Takehara as applied to claim 5 and further in view of Poradish et al. (U.S 5,293,511).

The admitted prior art does not appear to disclose that the base is ceramic, however Poradish utilizes a ceramic base.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to form the base of the admitted prior art and Takehara with ceramic to support the device as taught by Poradish (Abstract).

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art and Takehara as applied to claim 5 and further in view of Shoji (JP 401053795).

Neither APA nor Takehara appear to disclose a method of forming a metallic adhesive, however Shoji teaches the use of a metallic adhesive.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the combined DMD structure of APA and Takehara by forming a metallic adhesive between the base and chip to improve joint strength as taught by Shoji (Abstract).

Allowable Subject Matter.

Claims 3 and 13 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 16, 17 and 19 are allowable.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art does not disclose or make obvious sealing the chip at a temperature not higher than the temperature for attaching the chip to base or a metallic layer attached by a metallic adhesive between the back surface of chip and base substrate including all the limitations of its independent claims.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James Mitchell whose telephone number is (703) 305-0244. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 10:30-8:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David L. Talbott can be reached on (703) 305-9883. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-3432 for regular communications and (703) 305-3230 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

Application/Control Number: 09/847,620
Art Unit: 2827

Page 7

Jmm
April 7, 2003



DAVID L. TALBOT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800